UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,904	08/06/2002	Sheng Ted Tai Tsao		3458

7590 11/15/2006

SHENG (TED) TAI TSAO
2979 HEIDI DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95132

EXAMINER	
TANG, KENNETH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2195	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/713,904	TSAO, SHENG TED TAI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth Tang	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *16-27 and 30-36* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15,28 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 August 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 and 28-29 are presented for examination.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election without traverse of group I (Claims 1-15 and 28-29) in the reply filed on 9/26/06 is acknowledged. Applicant is required to cancel claims 16-27 and 30-36.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because there are numerous grammatical errors throughout the Specification. Applicant is required to

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected for referring to "(Fig. 2)". According to MPEP 608.01(k), Applicant can use reference characters to refer to a drawing, provided that it contains the elements enclosed within parenthesis. Applicant is required to include the element of Fig. 2.

5. Claim 1 is objected because the acronym CCDSVM is not initially spelled out in the claims.

6. Claims 1-15 and 28-29 are objected because only one period is allowed per claim. According to MPEP 608.01(k), "Each claim begins with a capital letter and ends with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See Fressola v.

Manbeck, 36 USPQ2d 1211 (D.D.C. 1995)." In addition, in claim 29, "etc." is indefinite because it causes the scope of the claim to not be ascertained.

7. Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 28 are objected for containing headings in bold that are not proper in claim construction. These bolded headings need to be removed and they are not given any patentable weight.

8. In claim 7, "send" should be replaced with "sent".

9. Claim 28 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

10. The claims lack the proper status identifiers and it is required that the Applicant put the claims in proper form with status identifiers. See MPEP 714(II)(C).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Regarding claims 6 and 29, the phrase "could be" and "for example" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (hereinafter Anderson) (US 2003/0084128 A1).

13. As to claim 1, Anderson teaches a method for supporting multiple simultaneous concurrent tasks within a single web-console in CCDSVM environment (FIG. 2) comprises the steps of:

(a) User login from web-console of console host into CCDSVM environment ([0037], [0072]).

(b) User from web-console of console host obtains all information of the target systems within CCDSVM environment (from task queue 14) ([0050], [0082]).

(c) User from web-console of console host selects target system and initiate tasks based on information of CCDSVM environment (from the task queue 14) ([0032]-[0034], [0050]).

(d) Console supporting software on control management station gets and stores tasks into a user space task list (task queue 14), and also obtains the associated locks for each tasks ([0032], [0040], [0058], [0059]).

(e) Console supporting software arranges tasks to be run on the target systems until the tasks got finished ([0082]-[0083]).

14. As to claim 2, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (a) further includes:

The web-console of console host gets login web-page from console supporting software of control management station ([0072], [0037]).

The user provides account name and password information to login-page on web-console of console host ([0072], [0031]).

The web-console of console host sends the authentication information to console supporting software of control management station ([0072], [0031]).

15. As to claim 3, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (a) further include

The console supporting software of control management station performs the authentication validation checking to determine if this user is allowed to login ([0072], [0031]).

16. As to claim 5, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (b) further includes:

The console supporting software of control management station gets necessary information from service software modules of all system units via communication link between them ([0072], [0030]-[0031]).

The console supporting software of control management station sends information of all system units, control management station and others to the web-console of console host ([0032]-[0034], [0050]).

17. As to claim 6, Anderson teaches wherein, step (b) further includes:

The information obtained by each user could be the IP address of each units within CCDSVM, could be a devices on a system such disk or network card or could be a file and all others, which are necessary to allow any users to initiate tasks in CCDSVM environment ([0017], [0070]).

18. As to claim 9, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (d) further includes:

The console supporting software of control management station gets task information from web-console of console hosts ([0032], [0040], [0058], [0059]).

The console supporting software of control management station stores information of each tasks one at time into a valid slot in its user space task list ([0032]-[0034], [0050]).

The console supporting software of control management station acquires associated locks to protect the resources used by each tasks and further to prevent each tasks from interfering each other or from blocking each other ([0058]-[0059]).

19. As to claim 10, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (d) further includes:

The locks acquired for each tasks could be conventional or non-conventional lock ([0058]-[0059]). The conventional lock can be acquired and released by same thread. The non-conventional lock can be acquired by one thread or process and be released by another thread or process.

20. As to claim 11, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (e) further includes:

Based on task information, the console support software of control management station determines which target system the task to be executed on ([0032]-[0034], [0050]).

21. As to claim 12, Anderson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein, step (e) further includes:

If the target of a task is for a system unit, the console support software of control management system transmits the task information to the service software module of the target system units. Otherwise, the task will carried out on control management station ([0082]-[0083]).

22. As to claim 13, Anderson teaches wherein, step (e) further includes:

The console support software of control management station or the service software module of system unit needs to determine if an additional thread needs to be created to carry out the tasks. If there is needs, an additional thread is created to carry out the task. Otherwise, the threads of the console support software modules of control management station, or the threads of service software modules of system unit carries out the task ([0082]). It is inherent that there is an additional thread that carries out the additional task.

23. As to claim 14, Anderson teaches wherein, step (e) further includes:

The console supporting software needs to determine if a task is permitted to run by a specific user, who initiated this task ([0031]).

The console supporting software also needs to determine if a task is permitted to run on a specific target system by a user, who initiated this task ([0031]).

24. As to claim 15, Anderson teaches wherein, step (d) and step (e) also includes each tasks' associated locks will be released one at a time along with each tasks' executing up to the point that task is done. Therefore, each tasks can be executed properly without any time delay ([0058]-[0059]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (hereinafter Anderson) (US 2003/0084128 A1) in view of Zhao (US 6,035,404).

26. As to claim 4, Anderson's invention can having multiple users logging in with their respective username/password on various console hosts. Anderson is silent on whether they can login concurrently. Zhao teaches multiple users concurrently logging into a network computing service system (col. 7, lines 15-32, see Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anderson's user login system to

include the well known feature (shown in Zhao) of multiple users logged in from various hosts because it makes it more convenient for the user if they don't have to wait for other users to be logged off, which thus saves time.

27. As to claims 7-8, they are rejected for similar reasons to the rejection of claim 4. The concurrent tasks are the tasks for the multiple concurrent user logins.

28. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (hereinafter Anderson) (US 2003/0084128 A1) in view of Jackson et al. (hereinafter Jackson) (US 2002/0152305 A1).

29. As to claims 28-29, Anderson teaches security authentication with a user login and password, wherein there are various privileges/access rights ([0031]). Anderson is silent in having a first level of security authentication for the control management station and a second level of security authentication for the system units. However, Jackson teaches having and specifying security levels (with username/passwords) for a plurality of processing engines with the capability of defining logical volumes such as size. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the network security system of Anderson to include Jackson's feature of a plurality of security levels for a plurality of

networked processing engines with the capability of defining logical volumes because this advantageously provides a separate or reserved communication path between the two processing engines (control management station and system unit) ([0400]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kt
11/6/06

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER